

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,683	11/19/2003	Viktor M. Keller	P-4628-2-D1-1-C1	6586
24492	24492 7590 08/25/2006		EXAMINER	
THE TOP-FLITE GOLF COMPANY, A WHOLLY OWNED SUBSIDIARY OF CALLAWAY GOLF COMPANY 2180 RUTHERFORD ROAD			GORDON, RAEANN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, LEGAL DEPT		3711		
CARLSBA	CARLSBAD, CA 92008-7328			4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A 11 -41-1				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/716,683	KELLER ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Raeann Gorden	3711				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2003.						
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-11 and 14-23</u> is/are pending in the application.						
·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-11,14-21 and 23</u> is/are rejected.						
•	☑ Claim(s) <u>4 and 22</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	ion Papers						
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	г.					
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receive	;a.				
Attachmen	• •						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) 🛛 Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date 3-29-04.		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 15-19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehm et al (5,683,312). Claims 1, 19, 20, Boehm discloses a golf ball comprising a core, an inner cover layer (22), and an outer cover layer. The inner cover layer has a Shore C hardness from 30 to 95. The outer cover layer is made from a polyurethane prepared from polyols and diisocyanates or polyisocyanates (col. 3). Claim 2, the PGA compression and COR are obvious since the materials appear to be similar and because the values are broad enough to include any golf ball. Claims 5-6 and 10, the inner cover layer may be made from styrene and butadiene or thermoplastic materials (col. 4). Claim 8, the inner cover layer has a Shore C hardness from 30 to 95. Claim 11, the inner cover layer has a thickness from 0.03 to 0.12 inch. Claims 15-18, Boehm discloses a golf ball comprising a core, a first inner cover layer, a second inner cover layer (22), and an outer cover layer. The second inner cover layer may be made from styrene and butadiene or thermoplastic materials (col. 4). The outer cover layer is made from a polyurethane prepared from polyols and diisocyanates or polyisocyanates (col. 3). The PGA compression and COR are obvious since the

Application/Control Number: 10/716,683

Art Unit: 3711

materials appear to be similar and because the values are broad enough to include any golf ball. One of ordinary skill in the art would vary the ranges for optimal performance.

### **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 8-11, 14, 19-21, and 23 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,663,508. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present invention and the '508 patent claim golf balls comprising a core, an inner cover layer made from polyurethane having a Shore D hardness of at least 60 and an outer cover layer made from polyurethane having a Shore D hardness of less than 53. Rearranging the limitations does not render a patentable distinction and is within the capabilities of one skilled in the art.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raeann Gorden whose telephone number is 571-272-4409. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tues, Thurs, Fri 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rg August 20, 2006

RAEANN GORDEN PRIMARY EXAMINER